

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/071,992	02/08/2002	Siegfried Mailaender	US 20 01 1067	2010	
7590 09/10/2004			EXAMINER		
Paul D. Greeley, Esq.			LEE, HWA S		
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
One Landmark Square			2877		
Stamford, CT	06901-2682		DATE MAILED: 09/10/200-	DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>y</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/071,992	MAILAENDER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew Hwa S. Lee	2877
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet with	
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a replicate the reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (including apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH atute, cause the application to become ABAN	ly be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) \boxtimes Responsive to communication(s) filed on R	RCE filed 8/2/04.	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matter	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	arawn from consideration.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.	•	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	rrection is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	g., p.,, unaci co o.o.o. g 1	(-) (-) (')
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		olication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		
application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.
Attachment(s)	· □	(070,440)
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sur Paper No(s)/	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakin et al (US 6,490,045) in view of Hung.

As for claim 1, Dakin et al (Dakin hereinafter) shows a fiber optic sensor comprising: a fiber connection (80, 110) to a DUT (90,100)

an optical circuit (for example 10-80) for providing an optical signal via said optical fiber to the DUT (90,100);

a shielding unit for holding the optical circuit and for providing at least a partial shielding of the optical circuit against mechanical noise (160).

As for claims 2-6, Dakin does not expressly show the details of the vibration isolating housing, however Hung shows that it is known in the prior art of using heavy damped tables and at the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have utilized a heavy damped table in order to isolate the interferometer form external vibrations (column 2, lines 1-5). Although Hung teaches that a heavy damped table is not necessary, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so in order to further isolate the optical circuit from vibration thus further improving signal quality.

Application/Control Number: 10/071,992 Page 3

Art Unit: 2877

As for claims 7, 12, 13, and 16, Solomon shows the use of additional damping devices and materials and at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place an additional damping device between the optical circuit and the shielding unit as it would have been well within the skill level of a skilled artisan to use various damping materials in different shapes, including rubber sheets, or other damping devices in between the shielding unit and the optical circuit in order to further isolate the interferometer from any vibration passing through the heavy damped table.

As for claim 8, the optical circuit is an interferometer.

As for claims 9-11 and 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a receiving device into order to hold the sensing fiber in the interferometer.

As for claim 14, the components of the interferometer provide substantially no vibration.

As for **claim 15**, Dakin shows all element as claimed in claim 1 in addition to:

an optical signal source (10) and

an optical receiver (150).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2877

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Hwa S. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2419. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley Jr. can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew H. S. Lee Art Unit 2877